

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herein. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

### **I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS**

Claims 1-119 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 55-58, and 112-119, which are independent, are hereby amended. Support for this Amendment is provided through the Specification as originally filed and specifically at pages 71 and 45 and Figures 70-82.

No new matter has been introduced by this amendment. Changes to the claims were not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes were made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

### **II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 1-4, 7, 10, 12, 17, 21, 25, 29, 33, 51, 52, 57-61, 64, 67, 69, 74, 78, 82, 86, 90, 108, 111, and 115-119 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,567,800 to Barrera et al. (hereinafter “Barrera”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,282,548 to Burner et al. (hereinafter “Burner”) and in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,170,007 to Venkataman et al. (hereinafter “Venkataman”) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,549,612 to Gifford et al. (hereinafter, merely “Gifford”).

Claims 5 and 62 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Barrera in view of Burner in view of Venkataman and in view of Gifford and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,311,058 to Wecker et al. (hereinafter “Wecker”).

Claims 6, 8-9, 14-16, 18-20, 22-24, 26-28, 30-32, 63, 65, 66, 71-73, 75-77, 79-81, 83-85, 87-89, and 114 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Barrera in view of Burner, in view of Venkataman and in view of Gifford and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,394,354 to Wilz, Sr. et al. (hereinafter “Wilz”).

Claims 11, 13, 53, 68, 70, and 109 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Barrera in view of Burner, in view of Venkataman in view of Gifford and and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,311,214 to Rhoads (hereinafter “Rhoads”).

Claims 34-48, 50, 54, 56, 91-106, 110, and 113 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Barrera in view of Burner, in view of Venkataman and in view of Gifford and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,505,212 to Nakano et al. (hereinafter “Nakano”).

Claims 55 and 112 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Barrera and Burner in view of Venkataman in view of Gifford and in view of Wilz and Nakano.

### III. RESPONSE TO REJECTIONS

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

**“...remotely executing an application that may or may not retrieve web site data such that whether content is retrieved is a function of the remotely executed application;**

previewing the generated one or more pages, any changes made on the one or more pages during previewing being automatically incorporated...

creating website data based on the interfaces and remotely executed application..." (Emphasis added)

Applicants respectfully submit that nothing has been found in Barrera, Burner, Venkataman, Gifford, Wecker, Wilz, Rhoads, or Nakano, taken alone or in combination, that would teach or suggest the above-identified features of claim 1.

Specifically, the cited references, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest remotely executing an application that may or may not retrieve web site data such that whether content is retrieved is a function of the remotely executed application and previewing the generated one or more pages, any changes made on the one or more pages during previewing being automatically incorporated and creating website data based on the interfaces and remotely executed application, as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, independent claim 1 is patentable.

Independent claims 55-58, and 112-119 are similar, or somewhat similar, in scope and are therefore patentable for similar, or somewhat similar, reasons.

#### IV. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

Similarly, because Applicants maintain that all claims are allowable for at least the reasons presented hereinabove, in the interests of brevity, this response does not comment on each and every comment made by the Examiner in the Office Action. This should not be taken as acquiescence of the substance of those comments, and Applicants reserve the right to address such comments.

### CONCLUSION

In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosure in the cited references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate the portions of the references providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,  
FROMMERM LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP  
Attorneys for Applicants

By:



Thomas F. Presson  
Reg. No. 41,442  
(212) 588-0800